United Nations A/58/876–S/2004/675

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
24 August 2004

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-eighth session
Agenda item 30
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Fifty-ninth year

Letter dated 23 August 2004 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary–General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 20 August 2004, addressed to you by Mehmet Dana, Chargé d'affaires a.i. and Deputy Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter were circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 30, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ümit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

04-46988 (E) 260804

Annex to the letter dated 23 August 2004 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

20 August 2004

I have the honour to convey herewith a copy of a letter dated 18 August 2004 addressed to you by H.E. Mr. Serdar R. Denktaş, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see enclosure).

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 30, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mehmet **Dana**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

Enclosure

18 August 2004

I have the honour to refer to the two letters from the Greek Cypriot representative to the United Nations in New York, dated 26 and 23 July, respectively, and circulated as documents A/58/859-S/2004/598 and A/58/857-S/2004/596, and to bring to your kind attention the following views and considerations.

In his first cited letter, the Greek Cypriot representative portrays the Cyprus question as a problem of "invasion and occupation" in an attempt to escape the Greek Cypriot side's grave responsibility in the creation and the continuation of the dispute.

It is, in fact, true that there is an occupation in Cyprus but this is the 41-year-old usurpation and continued occupation of the seat of government of the once bi-national partnership Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot side. The Turkish intervention on Cyprus carried out in accordance with its rights and obligations emanating from the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee was fully legal and legitimate under article 4 of the said Treaty. The Turkish Army is in Cyprus under legal obligations to keep peace pending a solution and the Turkish military presence on the island is a vital security requirement for the Turkish Cypriot people, particularly in the absence of a comprehensive political settlement. It is, of course, very convenient that the Greek Cypriot representative chose to overlook that it was the Greek Cypriots who rejected your comprehensive settlement plan which effectively addressed and eliminated that requirement.

It is a well-documented reality that the Cyprus question did not arise overnight on 20 July 1974 but is the result of a long history of events perpetuated by the Greek Cypriots in order to annex the island to Greece (Enosis). Following the destruction in December 1963 of the Republic of Cyprus and their rejection by force of arms from the partnership government, the Turkish Cypriot people outlived the agonies and losses of the Greek Cypriot armed attacks, were confined to small enclaves, subjected to gross violations of human rights including being rendered refugees many times over, living under open-air prison conditions. Thousands of Turkish Cypriot civilians lost their lives, were maimed or wounded, hundreds more went missing under the 11-year Greek Cypriot oppression.

It is only natural that the Turkish Cypriot people commemorate the anniversary of the timely Turkish intervention which not only saved them from total annihilation but freed their vested rights to speak and act for themselves through their separate will, which they used towards unification. The 65-per-cent majority at the Turkish Cypriot referendum on your plan demonstrated beyond doubt that the expressed will of the Turkish Cypriot people is in favour of a just and viable solution rather than secession as suggested by the Greek Cypriot representative. As for the participation of Turkey at the commemorations, it needs to be stressed that she chose to honour the Turkish Cypriot invitation despite the fact that her presence carried the risk of Greek Cypriot distortion regarding her policy on Cyprus.

It is, however, well known that the official Turkish policy on Cyprus has not deviated from the one demonstrated during the negotiating period on your settlement plan. As also recorded by you, Turkey has been more than forthcoming in not only

cooperating to develop a solution in Cyprus but strongly encouraging the Turkish Cypriot side to opt for the approval of your comprehensive settlement plan, which you had described as the only choice opposed to no settlement. It is, therefore, uncalled for to accuse Turkey of pursuing anything other than a bi-zonal, bi-communal solution based on political equality, the responsibility for the absence of which rests solely with the Greek Cypriot side.

The rejection of your plan by 76 per cent at the Greek Cypriot referendum demonstrated that, in overwhelming majority, neither the Greek Cypriot people nor their political leaders are ready to enter into a power-sharing arrangement with the Turkish Cypriots. Instead, they choose to continue to enjoy the benefits of the usurped title of the "Republic of Cyprus" and their new European Union membership. The reason behind this rejectionist attitude was openly stated by the Greek Cypriot leader Mr. Papadopoulos in his address on 7 April 2004, when he demanded a "resounding no" to the Annan plan from the Greek Cypriots. It was to achieve the "joint strategic goal" of "politically upgrading and shielding their internationally recognized state".

The so-called "confidence-building measures" which comprise the second cited letter of the Greek Cypriot representative are also designed to achieve the very same goal. It is beyond comprehension how the Greek Cypriot administration can present the said measures as an act of goodwill aimed at confidence-building when their refusal of your plan ensured that every single one, and all its added benefits including unification, did not materialize under a power-sharing arrangement.

I wish to stress, at the outset, that the Turkish Cypriot side has always been and is committed to promoting the search for resolution through the creation of confidence between the two peoples of the island. In fact, the sincerity of our expressed will in this regard has been repeatedly demonstrated by unilateral actions including our landmark decision providing for mutual crossings across the two sides as well as the recent sequence of decisions waiving all restrictions with regard to crossings as to time and duration of stay, organization of tourist tours and the requirement for producing a valid passport. As you are well aware our humanitarian initiative regarding the opening of a Greek Cypriot secondary school in the Karpaz peninsula has been praised as a major step of goodwill by the international community.

The nature of the Greek Cypriot proposals, on the other hand, constitute a striking example of their proficiency in presenting what they originally hamper as positive openings and skilfully exploiting the situation for political gain. As is known to the United Nations forces in Cyprus, the so-called military initiatives of the Greek Cypriot administration have been on the agenda for a long time and despite our constructive approach the efforts towards this end remained futile due to the political impediments created by the Greek Cypriot administration. Regarding the opening of additional crossing points, the Turkish Cypriot Government has long declared its unilateral intention and preparations on this issue in consideration of practical and economic needs. As for the opportunity for Turkish Cypriots to export their goods through Greek Cypriot ports, we witness a glaring example of the Greek Cypriot administration's intention to continue holding our economic development hostage to its political considerations as well as extending its illegal authority over Turkish Cypriots.

The above-stated mentality is evident on the issue of opening the port of Famagusta to international trade in addition to a cunning attempt to curtail international efforts to support the economic and social development of the Turkish Cypriot people. The European Union Council proposals on special conditions for trade with North Cyprus and the Greek Cypriot objections in this regard are well known and need no further elaboration. The timing and formulation of the Greek Cypriot proposals on this issue leave no room for doubt that they are mainly aimed at preventing the Council proposals from materializing in conjunction with the added benefit of acquiring land for Greek Cypriots, much more of which was on offer on a give-and-take basis in the very plan they overwhelmingly rejected.

For its part, the Turkish Cypriot side has certainly proved its dedication to reunification on the basis of partnership and political equality and that its firm conviction in this regard remains unchanged.

As for the Greek Cypriot side, we share the international opinion that if the Greek Cypriot side truly desires a bi-zonal, bi-communal solution based on power-sharing and equality, it is high time this is expressed not in words but in concrete actions isolated from any other political or tactical considerations. We only hope that the Greek Cypriot side will soon adopt the necessary constructive approach and instead of impeding international efforts start cooperating towards lifting the economic, social and political restrictions preventing the development of the Turkish Cypriot people, which is the only way to create another window of opportunity from the present impasse they have created.

We trust that your valuable efforts will play an effective role in bringing about this most desired outcome.

(*Signed*) Serdar R. **Denktaş**
Deputy Prime Minister
and Minister for Foreign Affairs